Fundamental properties of solutions to utility maximization problems in wireless networks

R. L. G. Cavalcante and S. Stańczak
Fraunhofer Heinrich Hertz Institute and Technical University of Berlin
email: {renato.cavalcante, slawomir.stanczak}@hhi.fraunhofer.de

arXiv:1610.01988v1 [cs.IT] 6 Oct 2016

***Abstract*—We introduce a unified framework for the study of utility maximization problems in interference-coupled wireless networks. The framework can be applied to a large class of utilities, but in this study special attention is devoted to the rate. In more detail, we resort to results from concave Perron-Frobenius theory to show that, within the class of problems we consider here, each problem has a unique solution. As a consequence, given any network utility maximization problem belonging to this class, we can define two functions that relate the power budget $\bar{p}$ of a network to the network utility and to the energy efficiency achieved by the solution to the given problem. Among many interesting properties, we prove that these functions are continuous and monotonic. In addition, we derive bounds revealing that the solution is characterized by a low and a high power regime. In the low power regime, the energy efficiency can decrease slowly as the power budget increases, and the network utility grows linearly at best. In contrast, in the high power regime, the energy efficiency typically scales as $\mathcal{O}(1/\bar{p})$ as $\bar{p} \to \infty$, and the network utility scales as $\mathcal{O}(1)$. We apply the theoretical findings to a novel weighted rate maximization problem involving the joint optimization of the uplink power and the base station assignment. For this novel problem formulation, we also propose a simple and practical iterative solver.**

I. Introduction

To cope with the ever increasing rate demand of wireless networks in a cost effective way, system engineers need to improve the energy efficiency, which often translates to increasing the rates for a given power budget. This fact has motivated many studies on tradeoffs between achievable rates and energy efficiency for many years [1]–[3]. In particular, the field of information theory has been fundamental to reveal bounds that cannot be exceeded irrespective of the available computational power [1], [2]. Unfortunately, extending existing information theoretic results to general wireless networks, while capturing limitations of practical hardware and communication strategies, has been proven notoriously difficult. However, as we show in this study, useful and surprisingly simple performance bounds for a large class of communication strategies in wireless networks are available if we depart from the formal setting of information theory.

In practical wireless systems, the parameters of a network configuration are often obtained by solving network utility maximization problems that can be equivalently posed as well known fixed point problems [4]–[11]. This connection between utility maximization and fixed point problems is particularly useful because it gives rise to efficient solvers that, from a mathematical perspective, are nothing but variations of existing fixed point algorithms. The results in this study builds upon connections of this type. We study properties of the solution to a fixed point problem to gain highly valuable insights into the energy efficiency and the utility that are achieved by solutions to many network utility maximization problems. For concreteness, here the focus is on utilities expressed in terms of the achievable rates or the signal-to-interference-noise-ratio (SINR).

In more detail, we start by formulating a canonical optimization problem that captures a large class of network utility maximization tasks. Similarly to other general frameworks for network utility maximization [6]–[10], we show the equivalence between the canonical problem and a conditional eigenvalue problem of positive concave mappings [12]. By recalling that conditional eigenvalue problems have a unique solution, this equivalence enable us to define functions that map the power budget to i) the energy efficiency (e.g., the sum throughput divided by total network transmit power), ii) to the transmit power of individual network elements, and iii) to the network utility of a configuration obtained by solving the canonical problem. Among many other useful properties,

we prove that these well defined functions are continuous and monotonic.

Given the large class of transmission strategies covered by the proposed framework, evaluating the functions relating a given power budget to the energy efficiency and to the network utility is typically only possible by solving the canonical problem with iterative algorithms. This process can be time-consuming, so we exploit known properties of the solution to conditional eigenvalue problems and results on asymptotic or recession functions in convex analysis [13] to derive simple and useful bounds for the network utility. These bounds are then used to derive novel bounds on the energy efficiency.

The above results reveal interesting phenomena that are shared by all network utility maximization problems that can be written in the canonical form proposed here. More specifically, the solutions are typically characterized by two power regimes: a low power regime and a high power regime. In both regimes, the network utility and the energy efficiency are always monotonically increasing and non-increasing, respectively, as a function of the power budget $\bar{p}$ available to the transmitters. However, in the low power regime, the energy efficiency is bounded by a constant, and the efficiency can decrease slowly as we increase the power budget. In contrast, the network utility is upper bounded by a linear function. In the high power regime, the energy efficiency shows a fast decay because it typically scales as $\mathcal{O}(1/\bar{p})$ as $\bar{p} \to \infty$ ($\mathcal{O}$ denotes the Landau symbol), whereas gains in network utility saturate because the network utility scales as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ as $\bar{p} \to \infty$. The bounds derived here do not depend on any unknown constants, so the power budget characterizing the boundary of the power regions is precisely known. In addition, we show that the spectral radius of lower bounding matrices (a concept introduced in [14]) provide us with a formal means of identifying *interference limited networks*, which we define as networks for which the utility cannot grow unboundedly as the power budget diverges to infinity. We also use the concept of recession functions in convex analysis to characterize networks for which the utility can grow unboundedly with increasing power budget, and we call these networks *noise limited networks*.

We illustrate the above theoretical findings in a novel joint uplink power control and base station assignment problem for weighted rate maximization. This application is related to that in [10], but here we use the recent results in [15], [16] to pose the optimization problem in terms of achievable rates instead of the SINR. As a result, we work directly with the variables of interest to system designers (in contrast, note that maximizing the SINR is only an indirect approach to the problem of improving the rate performance). We emphasize that solving weighted rate maximization problems by choosing appropriate coefficients for weighted SINR maximization problems may not be straightforward because the bijective relation between rate and SINR used in many studies is not affine. One interesting consequence of our novel formulation is that simple solvers based on fixed point algorithms become readily available. Furthermore, it exemplifies the validity of the theoretical findings with interference models based on concave mappings that are neither affine nor differentiable.

This study is structured as follows. In Sect. II we review definitions and known mathematical tools that are extensively used to prove the main results in this study. In Sect. III we introduce a new framework for the study of the energy efficiency and the achievable utility of solutions to a large class of network utility maximization problems. The general results obtained in Sect. III are illustrated with a concrete application in Sect. IV.

II. Preliminaries

The intention of this section is twofold. First, we try to make this study as self-contained as possible by presenting many standard definitions and results that are essential for the proofs in the next sections. Second, we clarify much of the notation used throughout this study. We note that much of the background material collected here has been taken directly from [6], [14].

In more detail, for given $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^N$, the inequality $\boldsymbol{x} \leq \boldsymbol{y}$ should be understood as a coordinate-wise inequality. The transpose of vectors or matrices is denoted by $(\cdot)^t$. The sets $\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++}$ are the sets of non-negative reals and positive reals, respectively. The spectral radius of a matrix $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ is given by $\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$, we denote by $\mathrm{dom} f := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N \mid f(\boldsymbol{x}) > -\infty\}$ the (effective) domain of f.

Fact 1 *[4, Theorems A.16 and A.51] Let $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N \times N}$ be a non-negative matrix, and let $\boldsymbol{n} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$ be arbitrary. A*

sufficient and necessary condition for the system $\boldsymbol{p} = \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{p}+\boldsymbol{n}$ *to have a positive solution* $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *is* $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) < 1$.

Definition 1 *(Irreducible matrices [4, Sect. A.4.1]) For* $N > 1$*, a non-negative matrix* $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ *is irreducible if there is no permutation matrix* $\boldsymbol{P} \in \{0,1\}^{N\times N}$ *such that* $\boldsymbol{P}^t\boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{P}$ *is a block upper triangular matrix.*

Later in the analysis of wireless networks, we use the following result related to non-negative irreducible matrices:

Fact 2 *[17] The spectral radius of an arbitrary non-negative irreducible matrix is lower bounded by its smallest row sum.*

Concave mappings, defined below, play a crucial role in the theory developed in the next sections. In the communication problems addressed here, these mappings are constructed with information about many environmental and control parameters, including user-base station assignment mechanisms, channel gains, and beamforming techniques, to name a few.

Definition 2 *(Concave mappings) We say that a mapping* $T : C \to \mathbb{R}^N$ *is a concave mapping if* $C \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ *is a convex set and*

$$(\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in C)(\forall \boldsymbol{y} \in C)(\forall \alpha \in \ ]0,1[)$$
$$T(\alpha\boldsymbol{x} + (1-\alpha)\boldsymbol{y}) \geq \alpha T(\boldsymbol{x}) + (1-\alpha)T(\boldsymbol{x}).$$

In this study we show the close relation between a large class of utility maximization problems and conditional eigenvalues of concave mappings. Before stating the conditional eigenvalue problem, we recall the definition of monotone norms used in [12], and we refer the reader to [18] for nonequivalent notions of monotonicity that are also common in the literature.

Definition 3 *(Monotone norm) A norm* $\|\cdot\|$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^N$ *is said to be monotone if*

$$(\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+)(\forall \boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+) \quad \boldsymbol{x} \geq \boldsymbol{y} \Rightarrow \|\boldsymbol{x}\| \geq \|\boldsymbol{y}\|.$$

Note that, in particular, the widely used l_p norms, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, are monotone in the sense of Definition 3.

Fact 3 *(Equivalence of norms in finite-dimensional spaces) Let* $\|\cdot\|_\alpha$ *and* $\|\cdot\|_\beta$ *be two arbitrary norms defined in* $\mathbb{R}^N$*. Then* $(\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N) \quad k_1\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\alpha \leq \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\beta \leq k_2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_\alpha$.

Recall that a sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is said to converge to $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if the sequence $\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_n - \boldsymbol{x}\|\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ converges to zero (by Fact 3, convergence to zero does not depend on the choice of the norm $\|\cdot\|$). In this case, we write $\lim_{n\to\infty} \boldsymbol{x}_n = \boldsymbol{x}$.

We can now formally introduce the conditional eigenvalue problem and a simple iterative solver:

Fact 4 *[12] Let* $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *be a concave mapping and* $\|\cdot\|$ *a monotone norm. Then each of the following holds:*

1) *There exists a unique solution* $(\boldsymbol{x}^\star, \lambda^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *to the conditional eigenvalue problem*

   Problem 1 *Find* $(\boldsymbol{x}, \lambda) \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ *such that* $T(\boldsymbol{x}) = \lambda\boldsymbol{x}$ *and* $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| = 1$.

   For reference, we call the scalar $\lambda^\star$ *the conditional eigenvalue of the mapping* T *for the norm* $\|\cdot\|$.

2) *The sequence* $\{\boldsymbol{x}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *generated by*

$$\boldsymbol{x}_{n+1} = T'(\boldsymbol{x}_n) := \frac{1}{\|T(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\|}T(\boldsymbol{x}_n), \quad \boldsymbol{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^N_+, \quad (1)$$

   converges geometrically to the uniquely existing vector $\boldsymbol{x}^\star \in \mathrm{Fix}(T')$*, which is also the vector* $\boldsymbol{x}^\star$ *of the tuple* $(\boldsymbol{x}^\star, \lambda^\star)$ *that solves Problem 1. Furthermore, the sequence* $\{\lambda_n := \|T(\boldsymbol{x}_n)\|\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *converges to* $\lambda^\star$.

To find a simple lower bound for the condition eigenvalue $\lambda^\star$ of a concave mapping T for any monotone norm, we can use the concept of lower bounding matrices introduced in [14]. These matrices are at the heart of many of the results in this study.

Definition 4 *(Lower bounding matrices [14]) Let* $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *be a continuous concave mapping, and denote by* $t_1 : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}_{++}, \ \ldots, t_N : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *the continuous concave functions such that* $[t_1(\boldsymbol{x}), \ldots, t_N(\boldsymbol{x})] := T(\boldsymbol{x})$ *for every* $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$*. The lower bounding matrix* $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ *of the mapping* T *is the matrix with its* i*th row and* j*th column given by*[1]

$$[\boldsymbol{M}]_{i,j} = \lim_{h\to 0^+} h\ t_i(h^{-1}\boldsymbol{e}_j) \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad (2)$$

where the limit can be shown to exist and $\boldsymbol{e}_j$ *(*$j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$*) is the vector with all components set to zero, except for the* j*th component, which is equal to one.*

[1] See [14, Example 1] for an alternative and equivalent construction method based on supergradients

Fact 5 *[6] Let $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N\times N}$ be the lower bounding matrix of a continuous concave mapping $T : \mathbb{R}_+^N \to \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$. In addition, let $(\boldsymbol{x}^\star, \lambda^\star) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^N \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be the solution to Problem 1 for an arbitrary monotone norm. Then we have $\lambda^\star > \rho(\boldsymbol{M})$.*

Note the strong connection between (2) and the concept of recession or asymptotic functions in convex analysis, which we use to study the behavior of networks in the high power regime:

Definition 5 *(Recession or asymptotic functions [13, Ch. 2.5]) Let $f : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be upper semicontinuous, proper, and concave. We define its recession or asymptotic function at $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ the function f_∞ given by:*

$$(\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \operatorname{dom} f) \quad f_\infty(\boldsymbol{y}) := \lim_{h\to\infty} \frac{f(\boldsymbol{x}+h\boldsymbol{y}) - f(\boldsymbol{x})}{h}.$$

The above limit can be more conveniently calculated by using [13, Corollary 2.5.3]

$$(\forall \boldsymbol{y} \in \operatorname{dom} f) \quad f_\infty(\boldsymbol{y}) = \lim_{h\to 0^+} hf(h^{-1}\boldsymbol{y}), \tag{3}$$

and the equality in (3) is valid for every $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ if $\boldsymbol{0} \in \operatorname{dom} f$. We also recall that asymptotic functions are **positively homogeneous** *[13, Proposition 2.5.1(a)].*

The next fact, quoted from [6], summarizes known properties of positive concave mappings.

Fact 6 *(Selected properties of positive concave mappings [6], [14], [19]) Let $T : \mathbb{R}_+^N \to \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$ be a continuous[2] concave mapping. Then each of the following holds:*

1) *(Scalability) $(\forall \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N)$ $(\forall \mu > 1)$ $\mu T(\boldsymbol{x}) > T(\mu\boldsymbol{x})$.*
2) *(Monotonicity) $(\forall \boldsymbol{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N)$ $(\forall \boldsymbol{x}_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N)$ $\boldsymbol{x}_1 \geq \boldsymbol{x}_2 \Rightarrow T(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \geq T(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$.*
3) *If the mapping T has a fixed point $\boldsymbol{x} \in \operatorname{Fix}(T) := \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \mid T(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}\} \neq \emptyset$, then the fixed point is unique (or, equivalently, $\operatorname{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$ is a singleton).*
4) *The mapping T has a fixed point if and only if there exists $\boldsymbol{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfying $T(\boldsymbol{x}') \leq \boldsymbol{x}'$.*
5) *If the mapping T has a fixed point, then it is the limit of the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{x}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_+^N$ generated by $\boldsymbol{x}_{n+1} = T(\boldsymbol{x}_n)$, where $\boldsymbol{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ is arbitrary. In particular, if $T(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \geq \boldsymbol{x}_1$ (resp. $T(\boldsymbol{x}_1) \leq \boldsymbol{x}_1$), then the sequence is monotonically nondecreasing (resp. monotonically nonincreasing) in each component.*
6) *Let $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N\times N}$ be the lower bounding matrix of the mapping T. If $\operatorname{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$, then $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) < 1$ (but the converse does not hold in general).*

[2]The assumption on continuity has been added to avoid unnecessary technical digressions. We note that most of these properties do not require this assumption.

Important results in the next sections require the following technical lemma, which is immediate from Fact 6.4 and Fact 6.5 (we omit the proof for brevity):

Lemma 1 *Let $T : \mathbb{R}_+^N \to \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$ be a continuous concave mapping. Then each of the following holds:*

1) *If there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{x}' \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ such that $T(\boldsymbol{x}') < \boldsymbol{x}'$, then $\operatorname{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$ and $\boldsymbol{x}^\star \in \operatorname{Fix}(T)$ satisfies $\boldsymbol{x}^\star < \boldsymbol{x}'$.*
2) *Assume that $\boldsymbol{x}^\star \in \operatorname{Fix}(T) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\boldsymbol{x}^\star > \boldsymbol{x}'$ for every vector $\boldsymbol{x}' \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$ satisfying $T(\boldsymbol{x}') > \boldsymbol{x}'$.*

III. Proposed framework

A. The canonical utility maximization problem

In this study, we are interested in utility maximization problems that can be posed in the following canonical form:

Problem 2 *(Canonical form of the network utility maximization problem)*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{maximize}_{\boldsymbol{p},c} & c \\ \text{subject to} & \boldsymbol{p} \in \operatorname{Fix}(cT) := \left\{\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \mid \boldsymbol{p} = cT(\boldsymbol{p})\right\} \\ & \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a \leq \bar{p} \\ & \boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^N, c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \end{array} \tag{4}$$

where $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is a design parameter hereafter called power budget, $\|\cdot\|_a$ is an arbitrary monotone norm, and $T : \mathbb{R}_+^N \to \mathbb{R}_{++}^N$ is an arbitrary **continuous** *concave mapping called interference mapping in this study. (Note that multiplication of a scalar $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ by the mapping T is defined in the usual way $cT : \mathbb{R}_+^N \to \mathbb{R}_{++}^N : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto cT(\boldsymbol{p})$.)*

For ease of reference, we say that a tuple $(\boldsymbol{p}, c) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^N \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is feasible to Problem 2 if it satisfies all constraints in (4). The set of all feasible tuples is defined to be the feasible set. If a feasible tuple is also a solution to Problem 2, then we say that this tuple is optimal.

Problem 2 covers a large array of network utility optimization problems. Particular instances include the optimization of the downlink power in load coupled networks [6], the joint

optimization of the uplink power and the cell assignment [10], and the optimization of the uplink receive beamforming [5, Sect. 1.4.2], to cite a few. Later in Sect. IV we show a novel weighted rate maximization problem that is also an instance of Problem 2.

Typically, in network utility maximization problems written in the canonical form shown above, the optimization variable $\boldsymbol{p}$ corresponds to the transmit power of network elements (e.g., base stations or user equipment); the optimization variable c, hereafter called *utility*, is the common desired rate, or, depending on the problem formulation, the SINR of all links; the norm $\|\cdot\|_a$ is chosen based on the energy source of the network elements (e.g., we can use the l_1 norm if all networks elements share the same source, or the l_∞ if the network elements have independent sources); and T is a known mapping modeling the interference coupling among network elements. In particular, the mapping T is constructed with information about many environmental and control parameters such as the pathgains, MIMO beamforming techniques, the user-base station assignment mechanisms, and the system bandwidth, to name a few. *For concreteness, in the next sections we use the above interpretation of the optimization variables to explain in words the implications of the main results in this study*.

B. Properties of the solution to the canonical problem

We now proceed to study properties of the solution to Problem 2, with particular focus given to the achievable utility and to the energy efficiency (see Definition 6). We start with the following result, which, in network utility maximization problems, shows that the utility (e.g., rates) strictly increases with increasing power budget:

Lemma 2 *Let $(\boldsymbol{p}', c') \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}'', c'') \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be solutions to Problem 2 with the power budget $\bar{p}$ set to, respectively, $\bar{p}' \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\bar{p}'' \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then $\bar{p}' < \bar{p}''$ implies $c' < c''$.*

Proof: An optimal tuple is by definition feasible to Problem 2, so in particular we have $0 < \|\boldsymbol{p}'\|_a \leq \bar{p}'$ and $\boldsymbol{p}' = c'T(\boldsymbol{p}')$. By $\bar{p}'' > \bar{p}'$, there exists $\beta > 1$ such that $\beta\|\boldsymbol{p}'\|_a = \bar{p}''$. Hence, by the scalability property of T (Fact 6.1), we obtain

$$\beta\boldsymbol{p}' = c'\beta T(\boldsymbol{p}') > c'T(\beta\boldsymbol{p}') > \boldsymbol{0}.$$

The above implies that there exists a scalar $\alpha > 1$ such that

$$\beta\boldsymbol{p}' > \alpha c'T(\beta\boldsymbol{p}'). \tag{5}$$

Let T' be the mapping defined by $T' : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto \alpha c'T(\boldsymbol{p})$. With $\hat{\boldsymbol{p}} := \beta\boldsymbol{p}'$, the relation in (5) can be equivalently written as $T'(\hat{\boldsymbol{p}}) < \hat{\boldsymbol{p}}$. Lemma 1.1 now shows that T' has a unique fixed point $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathrm{Fix}(T')$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{0} < \boldsymbol{u} < \hat{\boldsymbol{p}} = \beta\boldsymbol{p}'$. The norm $\|\cdot\|_a$ is monotone by assumption, so we have $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_a \leq \beta\|\boldsymbol{p}'\|_a = \bar{p}''$. As a result,

$$\boldsymbol{u} = T'(\boldsymbol{u}) = \alpha c'T(\boldsymbol{u}), \qquad \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_a \leq \bar{p}''.$$

The above shows that the tuple $(\boldsymbol{u},\ \alpha c') \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is feasible to Problem 2 with the power budget $\bar{p}$ set to $\bar{p}''$. Therefore, by $\alpha > 1$ and optimality of $(\boldsymbol{p}'', c'')$, we have $c' < \alpha c' \leq c''$, which is the desired result. □

An immediate consequence of Lemma 2 is that the constraint $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a \leq \bar{p}$ in (4) can be replaced by an equality, as shown in the next corollary.

Corollary 1 *Let $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be a solution to Problem 2. Then $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a = \bar{p}$.*

Proof: If $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ were optimal for $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a < \bar{p}$, then we could decrease the scalar $\bar{p}$ in Problem 2 without changing the optimal value $c^\star$ of the objective function in Problem 2. However, this result would contradict Lemma 2. □

We now have the necessary ingredients to relate the solution to Problem 2 to conditional eigenvalue problems.

Corollary 2 *Let the power budget $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ in Problem 2 be arbitrary. Then all the following are equivalent:*

(i) *$(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ solves Problem 2.*

(ii) *$(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the unique tuple satisfying $\frac{1}{c^\star}\boldsymbol{p}^\star = T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star)$ and $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a = \bar{p}$.*

(iii) *$(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the limit of the sequence $\{(\boldsymbol{p}_n, c_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ generated by $\boldsymbol{p}_{n+1} = (\bar{p}/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_a)\ T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)$ and $c_{n+1} = \bar{p}/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_a$, where $(\boldsymbol{p}_1, c_1) \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$ is arbitrary.*

Proof: (i)⇔(ii) By Corollary 1 and the definition of Problem 2, we have $\frac{1}{c^\star}\boldsymbol{p}^\star = T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star)$ and $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a = \bar{p}$ are necessary conditions for optimality of the tuple $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star)$. However, by considering Fact 4 with the monotone norm $\|\boldsymbol{p}\| := \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a/\bar{p}$, we know that there exists only one tuple satisfying these conditions, so these necessary conditions are also sufficient.

(ii)⇔(iii) Use once again the monotone norm $\|\boldsymbol{p}\| := \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a/\bar{p}$ in Fact 4 to prove the result. □

We now know from Corollary 2 that Problem 2 has a unique solution for any given power budget $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. This observation motivates the definition of the following functions:

Definition 6 *(Utility, power, and energy efficiency functions) Denote by* $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star_{\bar{p}},\ c^\star_{\bar{p}}) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *the uniquely existing solution to Problem 2 for a given power budget* $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$*. The utility and power functions are defined by, respectively,* $U : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++} : \bar{p} \mapsto c^\star_{\bar{p}}$ *and* $P : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \bar{p} \mapsto \boldsymbol{p}^\star_{\bar{p}}$*. In turn, given a monotone norm* $\|\cdot\|_b$*, the* $\|\cdot\|_b$*-energy efficiency function is defined as* $E : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++} : \bar{p} \mapsto U(\bar{p})/\|P(\bar{p})\|_b$*, and note that* $(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ E(\bar{p}) = 1/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star_{\bar{p}})\|_b = c^\star_{\bar{p}}/\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star_{\bar{p}}\|_b$ *by Corollary 2.*

Example 1 *If the monotone norm* $\|\cdot\|_b$ *is selected as the* l_1 *norm for a utility maximization problem in which* $\boldsymbol{p}$ *is a vector of transmit power of base stations (in Watts) and the utility* c *is the common rate achieved by users (in bits/second), then* $E(\bar{p})$ *shows how many bits each user receives for each Joule spent by a network optimized for the power budget* $\bar{p}$*. See [6] for an example of an application with variables having this interpretation.*

It follows from the definition of the utility function and Lemma 2 the following result.

Corollary 3 *The utility function* $U : \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *in Definition 6 is monotonically increasing; i.e.,* $(\forall \bar{p}' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\forall \bar{p}'' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ \bar{p}' > \bar{p}' \Rightarrow U(\bar{p}') > U(\bar{p}'')$.

With a mild assumption on the lower bounding matrix associated with the concave mapping in Problem 2, we can prove that the possible gain in utility obtained by increasing the power budget is limited.[3] Furthermore, we can also derive a conservative lower bound for the utility function. Its limit as the power budget diverges to infinity shows a utility for which strictly smaller values are achievable with a sufficiently large power budget. These results are formally stated in the next proposition.

[3]One of the inequalities in Proposition 1 has already appeared in [6]. However, that study considered only the l_∞ norm and a very particular max-min utility maximization problem in load coupled networks.

Proposition 1 *Consider the assumptions and definitions in Problem 2, and denote by* $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ *the lower bounding matrix of the interference mapping* $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$*. Let* $U : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *be the utility function in Definition 6. Then each of the following holds:*

(i) *(Upper bound)*

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\exists \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{++})$$
$$U(\bar{p}) \leq \begin{cases} \min\left\{ \dfrac{1}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})} - \epsilon, \dfrac{\bar{p}}{\|T(\boldsymbol{0})\|_a} \right\} & \text{if } \rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0 \\ \dfrac{\bar{p}}{\|T(\boldsymbol{0})\|_a} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

(ii) *(Lower bound) Let* $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *be an arbitrary scalar satisfying* $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_\infty \leq \beta\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a$ *for every* $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ *(see Fact 3). Then*

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \quad U(\bar{p}) \geq \frac{\bar{p}}{\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a}. \tag{7}$$

(iii) *(Asymptotic lower bound) Denote by* $g^{(i)} : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *the* i*th concave component function of the interference mapping* T*; i.e.,* $T(\boldsymbol{p}) =: [g^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{p}), \ldots, g^{(N)}(\boldsymbol{p})]^t$ *for every* $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$*. Let* $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *be as in part (ii) of the proposition, and define* $\boldsymbol{p}_\infty := [g^{(1)}_\infty(\mathbf{1}), \ldots, g^{(N)}_\infty(\mathbf{1})]$*, where* $g^{(i)}_\infty$ *is the asymptotic function of* $g^{(i)}$ *for* $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$ *(see Definition 5). Then we have*

$$c_\infty := \lim_{\bar{p}\to\infty} U(\bar{p}) \geq \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\beta\|\boldsymbol{p}_\infty\|_a} & \text{if} \quad \|\boldsymbol{p}_\infty\|_a > 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Proof: In this proof, we use the standard notation $P : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ for the power function in Definition 6.

(i) Define by $\|\cdot\|_{\bar{p}}$ the monotone norm $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_{\bar{p}} := (1/\bar{p})\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a$ for a given power budget $\bar{p}$. By Corollary 2, we have $\frac{1}{U(\bar{p})}P(\bar{p}) = T(P(\bar{p}))$ and $\|P(\bar{p})\|_{\bar{p}} = \|P(\bar{p})\|_a/\bar{p} = 1$ for every $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. If $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, it immediately follows from Fact 5 the first bound $U(\bar{p}) < 1/\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) < \infty$. More generally, irrespective of the value taken by $\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$, monotonicity of both the norm $\|\cdot\|_a$ and the mapping T (Fact 6.2) yields

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\frac{\bar{p}}{U(\bar{p})} = \frac{1}{U(\bar{p})}\|P(\bar{p})\|_a$$
$$= \|T(P(\bar{p}))\|_a \geq \|T(\boldsymbol{0})\|_a > 0.$$

The above implies $U(\bar{p}) \leq \bar{p}/\|T(\boldsymbol{0})\|_a$ for all $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Now taking the minimum of this bound and the preceding bound (if $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$) proves (i).

(ii) From the definition of the scalar β and Corollary 2, we deduce $\|P(\bar{p})\|_\infty \leq \beta \|P(\bar{p})\|_a = \beta \bar{p}$ for all $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Therefore, $(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ \ P(\bar{p}) \leq \|P(\bar{p})\|_\infty \mathbf{1} \leq \beta \|P(\bar{p})\|_a \mathbf{1} = \bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1}$. By using this relation together with Corollary 2, the monotonicity of $\|\cdot\|_a$, and monotonicity of T (Fact 6.2) we obtain

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \quad \frac{\bar{p}}{U(\bar{p})} = \frac{1}{U(\bar{p})} \|P(\bar{p})\|_a \\ = \|T(P(\bar{p}))\|_a \leq \|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a,$$

which implies (7) and completes the proof of (ii).

(iii) From (ii) we know that $0 < 1/U(\bar{p}) \leq (1/\bar{p})\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a$ for every $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. By taking the limit as $\bar{p} \to \infty$ and by considering (3) we deduce

$$0 \leq \lim_{\bar{p}\to\infty} \frac{1}{U(\bar{p})} \leq \|[g_\infty^{(1)}(\beta\mathbf{1}), \ldots, g_\infty^{(N)}(\beta\mathbf{1})]\|_a = \beta \|\boldsymbol{p}_\infty\|_a, \tag{9}$$

where the last equality comes from the fact that asymptotic functions are positively homogeneous (see Definition 5). The result in (9) implies the inequality in (8). □

The next example shows that known results in the literature [4, Ch. 5] are particular cases of the upper bound in Proposition 1(i). In addition, this example proves that the upper bound $1/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$ in (6) with $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$ is asymptotically tight for an important class of interference mappings that are common in max-min fairness problems in wireless networks [4].

Example 2 *Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ be arbitrary and assume that $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ is a matrix satisfying $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Now consider Problem 2 with the affine interference mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto \boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{p} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, and note that the lower bounding matrix of T is the matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$. Fact 1 shows that, for any $\epsilon \in\ ]0,1[$, the vector $\boldsymbol{p}_\epsilon = c_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{I} - c_\epsilon \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is strictly positive, where we define $c_\epsilon := \epsilon/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$. Therefore, given the power budget $\bar{p}_\epsilon = \|c_\epsilon(\boldsymbol{I} - c_\epsilon\boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_a = \|\boldsymbol{p}_\epsilon\|_a$, we have $\boldsymbol{p}_\epsilon \in \mathrm{Fix}(c_\epsilon T) \neq \emptyset$. Corollary 2 now shows that the tuple $(\boldsymbol{p}_\epsilon, c_\epsilon)$ is the solution to Problem 2 with the power budget $\bar{p}_\epsilon = (\epsilon/\rho(\boldsymbol{M}))\ \|(\boldsymbol{I} - (\epsilon/\rho(\boldsymbol{M}))\ \boldsymbol{M})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_a$. This result proves that any utility strictly smaller than $1/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$ can be achieved for the affine interference mappings considered in this example, provided that the power budget is large enough. More precisely, Corollary 3 shows that*

$$(\forall \epsilon \in\ ]0,1[)(\forall \bar{p} \geq \bar{p}_\epsilon) \quad U(\bar{p}) \geq c_\epsilon = \epsilon/\rho(\boldsymbol{M}), \tag{10}$$

where U is the utility function in Definition 6.

Another useful application of Proposition 1 is to identify noise limited networks and interference limited networks with a precise mathematical statement. In more detail, assume that we have a max-min fairness problem that can be posed in the canonical form in (4). For this problem, if c_∞ in Proposition 1(iii) is infinity, then any utility (e.g., rate) is achievable if the power budget is sufficiently large. In contrast, if the lower bounding matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ of the interference mapping T satisfies $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, then Proposition 1(i) shows that the utility cannot grow unboundedly, even with an arbitrarily large power budget. In other words, interference cannot be overcome by increasing the power budget.

By Corollary 3, the utility function is strictly increasing. In the next lemma, we prove that gains in utility necessarily comes at the expense of increased transmit power at *every* network element, regardless of the choice of the mapping T. In other words, the power function in Definition 6 is strictly increasing in each coordinate.

Lemma 3 *Let $P : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ be the power function in Definition 6. Then*

$$(\forall \bar{p}' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\forall \bar{p}'' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ \bar{p}' < \bar{p}'' \Rightarrow P(\bar{p}') < P(\bar{p}'').$$

Proof: Let $(\bar{p}', \bar{p}'') \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be arbitrary such that $\bar{p}' < \bar{p}''$, and let $U : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be the utility function in Definition 6. Define $T' : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto U(p')T(\boldsymbol{p})$ and $T'' : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto U(p'')T(\boldsymbol{p})$. From Corollary 2 we know that $P(p') \in \mathrm{Fix}(T')$ and $P(p'') \in \mathrm{Fix}(T'')$. In addition, since $U(p') < U(p'')$ by Corollary 3, we have $\mathbf{0} < T'(\boldsymbol{p}) < T''(\boldsymbol{p})$ for every $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$. In particular, for $\boldsymbol{p}' = P(p') \in \mathrm{Fix}(T')$, we obtain $\boldsymbol{p}' = T'(\boldsymbol{p}') < T''(\boldsymbol{p}')$, and the inequality $P(\bar{p}') < P(\bar{p}'')$ follows from Lemma 1.2. □

We are now in position to prove the first main result concerning the energy efficiency of networks.

Proposition 2 *Let $E : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be the $\|\cdot\|_b$-energy efficiency function in Definition 6. Then E satisfies the following:*

(i) $(\forall \bar{p}' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})(\forall \bar{p}'' \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ \bar{p}' < \bar{p}'' \Rightarrow E(\bar{p}'') \leq E(\bar{p}') \leq \dfrac{1}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b}$.

(ii) *Assume that $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, where $\boldsymbol{M}$ is the lower bounding matrix of the interference mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$. Then*

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \quad \frac{\alpha_1}{\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a} \leq E(\bar{p}) < \frac{\alpha_2}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\bar{p}}, \quad (11)$$

where $(\alpha_1,\ \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is an arbitrary tuple of scalars satisfying $\alpha_1\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_b \leq \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a \leq \alpha_2\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_b$ for every $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is an arbitrary scalar satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_\infty \leq \beta\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a$ for every $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ (see Fact 3).

(iii)

$$\lim_{\bar{p}\to 0^+} E(\bar{p}) = \frac{1}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b}. \quad (12)$$

Proof:

(i) Denote by $(\boldsymbol{p}', c') \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}'', c'') \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ the optimal tuples to Problem 2 with the design parameter $\bar{p}$ set to, respectively, $\bar{p}' \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\bar{p}'' \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. From $\bar{p}'' > \bar{p}'$ and Lemma 3, we obtain $\boldsymbol{p}'' > \boldsymbol{p}'$, which implies $T(\boldsymbol{p}'') \geq T(\boldsymbol{p}') \geq T(\mathbf{0}) > \mathbf{0}$ by Fact 6.2 and positivity of T. Monotonicity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_b$ now shows that

$$\begin{aligned} 1/E(\bar{p}'') = \|T(\boldsymbol{p}'')\|_b &\geq \|T(\boldsymbol{p}')\|_b \\ &= 1/E(\bar{p}') \geq \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

which implies the desired result.

(ii) Let $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star)$ be the solution to Problem 2 obtained by setting the power budget to an arbitrary value $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and recall that $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a = \bar{p}$ by Corollary 1. Since $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$ by assumption, we can use Proposition 1 to show that $c^\star < 1/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$. Altogether,

$$E(\bar{p}) = \frac{c^\star}{\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b} < \frac{1}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b} \leq \frac{\alpha_2}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a} = \frac{\alpha_2}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\bar{p}},$$

which concludes the proof of the upper bound in (11). For the lower bound, divide both sides of (7) by $\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b > 0$ and use $\bar{p} = \|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_a \geq \alpha_1\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b$ to obtain the desired result

$$E(\bar{p}) = \frac{c^\star}{\|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b} \geq \frac{\bar{p}}{\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a\ \|\boldsymbol{p}^\star\|_b} \geq \frac{\alpha_1}{\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a}.$$

(iii) Denote by U and P the utility and power functions, respectively, in Definition 6. Let $\{\bar{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be an arbitrary sequence satisfying $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{p}_n = 0$, and construct the sequence of tuples $\{(\boldsymbol{p}_n, c_n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$, where $(\boldsymbol{p}_n, c_n) := (P(\bar{p}_n), U(\bar{p}_n))$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By Corollary 2 and Fact 3, we know that $1/E(\bar{p}_n) = \|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_b$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_b = \lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{p}_n = 0$, hence $\lim_{n\to\infty} \boldsymbol{p}_n = \mathbf{0}$. Recalling that $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ is continuous by assumption and that norms are also continuous, we obtain:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{E(\bar{p}_n)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_b = \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b > 0,$$

which implies the desired result in (12) because the sequence $\{\bar{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is arbitrary. □

In words, Proposition 2(i) shows that improving the utility of the solution to Problem 2 by increasing the power budget (see Corollary 3) cannot improve the energy efficiency. It also proves that the energy efficiency is uniformly bounded above by $1/\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b$, and, as a consequence of Proposition 2(iii), this bound is achieved asymptotically as the power budget decreases to zero. This result is independent of the choice of the interference mapping. Proposition 2(ii) shows simple upper and lower bounds for the energy efficiency function. An interesting property of these bounds is that they are readily available without solving any optimization problems. In particular, we can show that the upper bound in Proposition 2(ii) is as tight as possible, in the sense that there are mappings for which the upper bound is achieved asymptotically as the power budget diverges to infinity:

Example 3 *Consider the model and definitions in Example 2. Recalling that $\|P(\bar{p})\|_a = \bar{p}$ for every $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ by Corollary 1, where $P : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ is the power function in Definition 6, we deduce from (10):*

$$(\forall \epsilon \in\ ]0,1[)(\forall \bar{p} \geq \bar{p}_\epsilon)\ E(\bar{p}) = \frac{U(\bar{p})}{\|P(\bar{p})\|_a} = \frac{U(\bar{p})}{\bar{p}} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\bar{p}},$$

where E is the $\|\cdot\|_a$-energy efficiency function in Definition 6. In words, the above proves that the $\|\cdot\|_a$-energy efficiency function can be made arbitrarily close to the upper bound in Proposition 2(ii) with the choice $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 1$ for a sufficiently large power budget $\bar{p}$.

We are now ready to prove that all functions in Definition 6 are continuous at every point in $\mathbb{R}_{++}$.

Proposition 3 *Let $\{\bar{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}_{++}$ be an arbitrary sequence of power budgets converging to an arbitrary scalar $\bar{p}^\star \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Consider the $\|\cdot\|_b$-energy efficiency function $E : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$, the utility function $U : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and the power function $P : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ in Definition 6. Then each of the following holds:*

(i) $\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\bar{p}_n) = P(\bar{p}^\star)$;

(ii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} U(\bar{p}_n) = U(\bar{p}^\star)$*; and*

(iii) $\lim_{n\to\infty} E(\bar{p}_n) = E(\bar{p}^\star)$.

Proof: To simplify the notation in the proof, we define $(\boldsymbol{p}_n, c_n) := (P(\bar{p}_n), U(\bar{p}_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star) := (P(\bar{p}^\star), U(\bar{p}^\star)) \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathbb{R}_{++}$.

(i) The sequence $\{\bar{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is bounded because it converges to $\bar{p}^\star$, so the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is also bounded because $\|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_a = \bar{p}_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see Corollary 2). Therefore, by [20, Lemma 2.38] and [20, Lemma 2.41(ii)] (see also [13, Sect. 2.1]), we prove the desired result $\lim_{n\to\infty} \boldsymbol{p}_n = \boldsymbol{p}^\star$ if we show that $\boldsymbol{p}^\star$ is the only accumulation point of the bounded sequence $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$.

By the equivalence of norms in finite dimension spaces, there exists a constant $b \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_1 \leq b$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\boldsymbol{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$ be an arbitrary accumulation point of $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. As a consequence of [21, Theorem 6.7.2], we can extract from $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ a subsequence $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in K_1}$, $K_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$, converging to $\boldsymbol{p}' \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$. By Corollary 2, the definition of the scalar b, and monotonicity of concave mappings (Fact 6.2), we have

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad \mathbf{0} < T(\mathbf{0}) \leq \frac{1}{c_n}\boldsymbol{p}_n = T(\boldsymbol{p}_n) \leq T(b\mathbf{1}) \text{ and } \|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_a = \bar{p}_n. \tag{14}$$

Therefore, monotonicity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_a$ and (14) yield

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad 0 < \frac{\|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_a}{\|T(b\mathbf{1})\|_a} = \frac{\bar{p}_n}{\|T(b\mathbf{1})\|_a} \leq c_n \leq \frac{\|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_1}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_1} \leq \frac{b}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_1}. \tag{15}$$

The above inequalities show that the sequence $\{c_n\}_{n\in K_1}$ is bounded, so we can use the Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem to find a subsequence $\{c_n\}_{n\in K_2}$, $K_2 \subset K_1 \subset \mathbb{N}$, converging to a scalar c'. From (15), we also know that $c' = \lim_{n\in K_2} c_n \geq \lim_{n\in K_2} \bar{p}_n/\|T(b\mathbf{1})\|_a = \bar{p}^\star/\|T(b\mathbf{1})\|_a > 0$. As a result, from the continuity of the mapping T, $K_2 \subset K_1$, and (14),

$$\frac{1}{c'}\boldsymbol{p}' = \lim_{n\in K_2} \frac{1}{c_n}\boldsymbol{p}_n = \lim_{n\in K_2} T(\boldsymbol{p}_n) = T(\boldsymbol{p}'), \tag{16}$$

and, from continuity of norms and (14),

$$\|\boldsymbol{p}'\|_a = \lim_{n\in K_2} \|\boldsymbol{p}_n\|_a = \lim_{n\in K_2} \bar{p}_n = \bar{p}^\star. \tag{17}$$

By using Corollary 2 once again, (16) and (17) show that the tuple $(\boldsymbol{p}', c')$ is the unique solution to the conditional eigenvalue problem that we can use to obtain the unique solution $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star,\ c^\star)$ to Problem 2 with the power budget $\bar{p}^\star$. As a result, we have $\boldsymbol{p}^\star = \boldsymbol{p}'$, which shows that $\boldsymbol{p}^\star$ is the only accumulation point of the bounded sequence $\{\boldsymbol{p}_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ because the accumulation point $\boldsymbol{p}'$ was chosen arbitrarily, and the proof is complete.

(ii) First note that the inequality $\|T(\boldsymbol{p})\|_a \geq \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a > 0$, valid for every $\boldsymbol{p}$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$, is immediate from Fact 6.2 and monotonicity of the norm $\|\cdot\|_a$. Since $c_n = \bar{p}_n/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_a \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\bar{p}^\star/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star)\|_a = c^\star$ by Corollary 2, we can use (i) and continuity of T to obtain $\lim_{n\to\infty} c_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{p}_n/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_a = \bar{p}^\star/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star)\|_a = c^\star$.

(iii) As shown above, we have $\|T(\boldsymbol{p})\|_b \geq \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b > 0$ for every $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_+$, so $E(\bar{p}_n) = 1/\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_b \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, (i) and continuity of the mapping T yield

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E(\bar{p}_n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\|T(\boldsymbol{p}_n)\|_b} = \frac{1}{\|T(\boldsymbol{p}^\star)\|_b} = E(\bar{p}^\star),$$

which completes the proof. □

For convenience, the next corollary summarizes some of the main properties of the energy efficiency function proved in Proposition 2 and Proposition 3.

Corollary 4 *Let $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ be the lower bounding matrix of the concave mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ in Problem 2. Then the $\|\cdot\|_b$-energy efficiency function $E : \mathbb{R}_{++} \to \mathbb{R}_{++}$ in Definition 6 satisfies the following:*

(i) $\lim_{\bar{p}\to 0^+} E(\bar{p}) = \sup_{\bar{p}>0} E(\bar{p}) = 1/\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b$*;*

(ii) *E is continuous, monotonically non-increasing, and*

$$(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}) \quad \frac{\alpha_1}{\|T(\bar{p}\beta\mathbf{1})\|_a} \leq E(\bar{p}) \leq \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b} & \text{if} \quad \rho(\boldsymbol{M}) = 0 \\ \min\left\{\dfrac{1}{\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_b},\ \dfrac{\alpha_2}{\rho(\boldsymbol{M})\bar{p}}\right\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

where $\alpha_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ are arbitrary scalars satisfying $\alpha_1\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_b \leq \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a \leq \alpha_2\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_b$ and $\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_\infty \leq \beta\|\boldsymbol{p}\|_a$ for every $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ (see Fact 3).

C. Power regimes in network utility maximization problems

By considering all possible continuous concave mappings $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ with corresponding lower bounding matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ satisfying $r(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, we observe that the upper bounds in Proposition 1 and Corollary 4 are tight as the power budget $\bar{p}$ diverges to infinity, in the sense that there exist continuous concave mappings $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}}_{++}$ for which the upper

bounds on the utility and on the $\|\cdot\|_a$-energy efficiency are achieved asymptotically as $\bar{p} \to \infty$ (see Examples 2 and 3). Furthermore, we recall that the upper bound is always tight as the power budget tends to zero. As a result, if $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, the upper bounds in (6) and (18) motivate the definition of two power regimes: a low power regime ($\bar{p} \leq \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$) and a high power regime ($\bar{p} > \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$). The transition between these two regimes happens at the transient point $\bar{p} = \|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$.

For simplicity, let us focus for the moment on the $\|\cdot\|_a$-energy efficiency function in Definition 6, which we denote by E_a. In the low-power regime, the energy efficiency function E_a can decrease very slowly because only the bound $E_a(\bar{p}) \leq 1/\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a$ in (18) is effective, and this bound does not depend on the power budget $\bar{p}$. In contrast, the utility function U in Definition 6 increases at best linearly in this power regime. These observations shows that, in typical wireless communication problems, we should transmit with low power and low utility (e.g., rates) if high transmit energy efficiency is desired. In the high power regime, the energy efficiency eventually decays quickly as the power budget $\bar{p}$ diverges to infinity because the bound $E_a(\bar{p}) < 1/(\bar{p}\ \rho(\boldsymbol{M}))$ becomes effective, while gains in utility eventually saturate because of the uniform bound $(\forall \bar{p} \in \mathbb{R}_{++})\ U(\bar{p}) \leq 1/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$.

The above observations are illustrated in Fig. 1. Note that the $\|\cdot\|_a$-energy efficiency function E_a is continuous, converges to the upper bound $1/\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a$ as the power budget $\bar{p}$ decreases to zero, and decreases within the hatched areas corresponding to the power regimes. Furthermore, the utility function U is also continuous, converges to zero as the power budget $\bar{p}$ decreases to zero, and increases within the hatched areas corresponding to the power regimes [this area can be decreased by considering the lower bounds in Proposition 1(ii) and Proposition 2(ii), which depend on the particular mapping T].

Interestingly, the above properties of the energy efficiency function and the utility function hold for all network utility maximization problems that can be posed in the canonical form in (4). Equipping the network with advanced communication technologies such as massive MIMO, transmitter and receiver beamforming techniques, intelligent user-base station assignment mechanisms, or a combination of all these technologies can only change the position of the transient point



(a)



(b)

Fig. 1: Power regimes for the solution to Problem 2 as a function of the power budget. The lower bounding matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ associated with the mapping T is assumed to satisfy $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$. (a) Energy efficiency. (b) Utility.

and move upwards the bounds on the energy efficiency and the utility. However, if $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$, these two power regimes are always present, and the energy efficiency and the network utility scale as $E(\bar{p}) \in \mathcal{O}(1/\bar{p})$ and $U(\bar{p}) \in \mathcal{O}(1)$ as $\bar{p} \to \infty$, respectively. It is also worth noticing that the asymptotic result on the energy efficiency is independent of the choice of the norm $\|\cdot\|_b$ because of Fact 3.

IV. Exemplary application

We now illustrate the results obtained in the previous section with a concrete application; namely, a novel joint power control and base station allocation problem for weighted rate maximization.

A. System model and the proposed algorithm

Denote by $\mathcal{M}$ and by $\mathcal{N} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ the set of base stations and the set of users, respectively, in a network. The pathloss between base station $i \in \mathcal{M}$ and user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ is indicated by the variable $g_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Let $\boldsymbol{p} = [p_1, \ldots, p_N] \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ be the uplink power vector, where $p_j \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the uplink transmit power of user $j \in \mathcal{N}$. The SINR of user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ if connected to base station $i \in \mathcal{M}$ for a given power allocation $\boldsymbol{p} = [p_1, \ldots, p_N] \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ is given by

$$s_j : \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \times \mathcal{M} : (\boldsymbol{p}, i) \mapsto \frac{p_j g_{i,j}}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{j\}} p_k g_{i,k} + \sigma_i^2}.$$

We assume that users connect to their best serving base stations and that each user is equipped with a single-user decoder that treats interference as noise. With these assumptions, the achievable rate of user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ for a given power allocation $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ under Gaussian noise is commonly approximated by $\max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i))$, where B is the system bandwidth.

The utility maximization problem we solve in this section, which we refer to as the weighted rate allocation problem, is formally stated as:

Problem 3 *(The weighted rate allocation problem)*

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{maximize}_{\boldsymbol{p}, c} & c \\ \text{subject to} & cw_j = \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i)) \ (\forall j \in \mathcal{N}) \\ & \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_\infty \leq \bar{p} \\ & \boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}, c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \end{array} \tag{19}$$

where $w_j \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is the weight or priority assigned to the rate $c\omega_j$ of user $j \in \mathcal{N}$. To gain intuition on the weights $(w_j)_{j \in \mathcal{N}}$, we now relate two particular choices to traditional network utility maximization problems. The simplest choice is the use of uniform weights $w_k = w_j = 1$ for every $(k, j) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$, in which case the solution to Problem 3 can be shown to maximize the minimum observed rate in the network (max-min fairness). As a second example of a weighting scheme related to that used later in the simulations, for a fixed power $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, we can use $w_j = \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} B \log_2(1 + \bar{u} g_{i,j} / \sigma_i^2)$ for every $j \in \mathcal{N}$. With this choice, w_j is simply the best rate that each user j can achieve if alone in the system and transmitting at full power $\bar{u}$. In particular, if $\bar{u} = \bar{p}$, then the solution $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star)$ to Problem 3 allocates to each user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ the fraction $c^\star \in \ ]0, 1]$ of its best individual achievable rate w_j. The number $c^\star$ is the largest fraction common to all users that the network can support.

We now proceed to state Problem 3 in the canonical form in (4). For any $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and $j \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying the first constraint in (19), we have

$$\begin{aligned} cw_j = \max_{i \in \mathcal{M}} B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i)) \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{c} = \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{w_j}{B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i))} \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{c} p_j = \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{w_j p_j}{B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i))}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the first constraint in Problem 3 can be equivalently written as

$$\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathrm{Fix}(c\tilde{T}), \tag{20}$$

where $\tilde{T} : \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto [\tilde{h}_1(\boldsymbol{p}), \ldots, \tilde{h}_N(\boldsymbol{p})]$ and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \tilde{h}_j : \mathbb{R}^N_{++} & \to & \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \\ \boldsymbol{p} & \mapsto & \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \dfrac{w_j p_j}{B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i))} \end{array}$$

for every $j \in \mathcal{N}$.

For fixed $i \in \mathcal{M}$, we know by [16, Lemma 2] that $w_j p_j / (B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i)))$ as a function of $\boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ is concave for every $j \in \mathcal{N}$, hence $\tilde{h}_j$ is also concave for every $j \in \mathcal{N}$ because it is the minimum of concave functions [20, Proposition 8.14]. Therefore, by replacing the rate constraint in Problem 3 by the constraint in (20), we have Problem 3 in the canonical form in (4), except that the domain of the mapping $\tilde{T}$ must be extended to include the boundary $\mathbb{R}^N_+ \setminus \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$. By [22, Theorem 10.3], we know that each function $\tilde{h}_j$, $j \in \mathcal{N}$, has one and only one continuous extension to $\mathbb{R}^N_+$, and by following similar arguments to those used in the proof of [16, Lemma 3], the continuous extension of the mapping $\tilde{T}$ is given by

$$T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++} : \boldsymbol{p} \mapsto [h_1(\boldsymbol{p}), \ldots, h_N(\boldsymbol{p})], \tag{21}$$

where

$$\begin{array}{rcl} h_j : \mathbb{R}^N_+ & \to & \mathbb{R}^N_{++} \\ \boldsymbol{p} & \mapsto & \begin{cases} \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \dfrac{w_j p_j}{B \log_2(1 + s_j(\boldsymbol{p}, i))} & \text{if } p_j = 0 \\ \min_{i \in \mathcal{M}} \dfrac{w_j \ln 2}{B g_{i,j}} \left(\sum_{k \in \mathcal{N} \setminus \{j\}} p_k g_{i,k} + \sigma_i^2 \right) & \\ \qquad \text{otherwise,} & \end{cases} \end{array}$$

for every $j \in \mathcal{N}$.

The above discussion shows that the weighted rate allocation problem is equivalent to the following problem in the canonical form:

Problem 4

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maximize}_{\boldsymbol{p},c} \quad & c \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \boldsymbol{p} \in \text{Fix}(cT) \\ & \|\boldsymbol{p}\|_\infty \leq \bar{p} \\ & \boldsymbol{p} \in \mathbb{R}^N_{++},\ c \in \mathbb{R}_{++}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the application under consideration the mapping $T : \mathbb{R}^N_+ \to \mathbb{R}^N_{++}$ is given by (21). We can now use the simple iterative scheme in Corollary 2(iii) to solve Problem 3. Furthermore, all bounds derived in Sect. III are available because the continuous mapping T is defined at $\mathbf{0}$. Once a solution $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star)$ is obtained, we recover an optimal user-base station assignment by connecting each user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ to any base station $i \in \arg\max_{l\in\mathcal{M}} s_j(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, l)$ providing the best SINR $\max_{l\in\mathcal{M}} s_j(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, l)$.

Note that the component of the kth column and jth row of the lower bounding matrix $\boldsymbol{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times N}_+$ of the interference mapping T in (21) is given by

$$[\boldsymbol{M}]_{j,k} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if} \quad k = j \\ \min_{i\in\mathcal{M}} \dfrac{w_j g_{i,k} \ln(2)}{B g_{i,j}} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By using Fact 2 with the assumption $g_{i,k} \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ for every $i \in \mathcal{M}$ and $j \in \mathcal{N}$, we conclude that $\rho(\boldsymbol{M}) > 0$ because only the diagonal terms of the non-negative matrix $\boldsymbol{M}$ are zero. Therefore, as an immediate consequence of Proposition 1, we also verify that the network considered here is interference limited because the rates cannot grow unboundedly by increasing the power budget.

The bounds in (6) and in (18) can also provide us with intuition on optimal assignment strategies in the low power regime. For example, Corollary 4 shows that the energy efficiency function, which is continuous, converges to $1/\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_a$ as the power budget decreases to zero. The jth component of the vector $T(\mathbf{0})$ is $h_j(\mathbf{0}) = \min_{i\in\mathcal{M}} w_j \sigma_i^2 \ln 2/(B g_{i,j})$ by definition, which shows that, as the power budget decreases to zero, each user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ selects the base station $i \in \mathcal{M}$ with the smallest ratio $\sigma_i^2/g_{i,j}$. If the noise power σ_i^2 is the same at every base station $i \in \mathcal{M}$, then we obtain the intuitive result that each user selects the base station with the best propagation condition, which is the expected result in a regime where noise dominates interference.

B. Simulations

The simulations in this section are based on the "dense urban information society" scenario provided by the METIS project [23, Sect. 4.2] [24], which is depicted in Fig. 2. For simplicity, we only use the microcells of that scenario. The pathloss between users and microcells are obtained from the lookup tables available at [24]. For the simulation, we place 30 users uniformly at random on the streets or the park within the box region $10\text{m} \leq x \leq 377\text{m}$ and $10\text{m} \leq y \leq 542\text{m}$ of the network in Fig. 2. Users are free to connect to any microcell in the whole region. The noise power spectral density at every base station is -145 dBm/Hz, and the total system bandwidth is 10 MHz.



Fig. 2: Madrid scenario of the METIS project. Buildings are represented by dark gray squares and rectangles. Areas in white color indicate the presence of streets or parks. Circles and triangles indicate the location of the microcells and users, respectively.

The user priorities $\boldsymbol{w} = [w_1, \ldots, w_N]$ to build the concave mapping T in (21) are assigned as follows. We first compute the interference-free rate $b_j \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ of each user $j \in \mathcal{N}$ when transmitting at 1 W; i.e., $b_j = \max_{i\in\mathcal{M}} B \log_2(1 + 1 g_{i,j}/\sigma_i^2)$. We then use the weight vector $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{b}/\|\boldsymbol{b}\|_\infty$, where $\boldsymbol{b} := [b_1, \ldots, b_N]$. With this normalization, the solution $(\boldsymbol{p}^\star, c^\star)$ to Problem 4 has the following interpretation. The utility $c^\star$ is the highest rate observed in the network, and the weight $w_j \in \ ]0, 1]$ is the fraction of this maximum rate that is assigned to user j. As described above, for $\bar{p} = 1$, each user gets the same fraction of the rates that they could achieve if alone in the system.

The above discussion shows that the sum throughput of the network is $\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_1 c^\star$. To evaluate the energy efficiency of the solution to Problem 4 with these settings, for given power budget $\bar{p}$, we use the l_∞-energy function scaled by $\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_1$; i.e., we use $\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_1 E(\bar{p})$, where E is the function used in (18) for the monotone norm $\|\cdot\|_b = \|\cdot\|_\infty$. By considering



Fig. 3: Energy efficiency as a function of the power budget $\bar{p}$.



Fig. 4: Highest rate as a function of the power budget .

Corollary 1, this scaled version of the l_∞-energy efficiency, which has dimension bits/Joule, shows the ratio between the sum throughput in the network and the maximum observed transmit power $\bar{p}$ of a user.

We approximate the solution to Problem 4 by applying 5,000 iterations of the fixed point algorithm in Corollary 2(iii) with the mapping T in (21). The starting power allocation of the iterations is $\boldsymbol{p}_1 = \mathbf{0}$. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the energy efficiency and the utility (i.e., the rates) obtained with the simulation. For the bounds in (18), we use $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \beta = 1$. We can see that the results are consistent with the analysis in Sect. III. Even with a nonlinear mapping such as that in (21), we can clearly identify the two power regimes described in Sect. III-C. In particular, with power a power budget above $\|T(\mathbf{0})\|_\infty/\rho(\boldsymbol{M})$, which characterizes the high power regime, we note that increasing the power budget by orders of magnitude improves the achievable rates only marginally. We also observe a gap in the rate and energy efficiency bounds in the high SINR regime, which is expected because tightness of the bounds in this regime are not necessarily guaranteed (even asymptotically) for utility maximization problems with arbitrary interference mappings.

V. Summary and Conclusions

We have proved that the energy efficiency and the utility (e.g., rates or SINR) of solutions to a large class of network utility maximization problems are continuous and monotonic as a function of the power budget $\bar{p}$ available to the network. Furthermore, we used the concept of lower bounding matrices introduced in [14], or, more generally, the concept of asymptotic or recession functions in convex analysis [13], to derive simple upper and lower bounds for the energy efficiency and for the network utility. In particular, the upper the bounds reveal that the solutions are characterized by a low power regime and a high power regime, and the transition point is precisely known. In the low power regime, the upper bounds are asymptotically tight (i.e., when the power budget tends to zero). The energy efficiency can decrease slowly as the power budget increases, whereas the utility grows linearly at best as a function of the power budget. In the high power regime, the typical behavior of interference-limited networks is that there are marginal gains in network utility and a fast decrease in energy efficiency as the power budget tends to infinity. In addition, the upper bounds we derived here are asymptotically tight (as the power budget diverges to infinity) for the important family of network utility maximization problems constructed with affine interference mappings.

The general theory developed here was illustrated with a novel joint uplink power control and base station assignment problem for weighted rate allocation. One of the main advantages of the novel formulation is that it works directly with the rate of users, which is the parameter that network engineers are typically interested in maximizing. We showed that this problem can be solved optimally with a simple iterative method that, from a mathematical perspective, is nothing but a fixed point algorithm that solves a conditional eigenvalue problem. In this application, simulations show that the bounds are particularly good in the low power regime, and they are within the same order of magnitude of the optimal values in the high power regime. Therefore, the bounds derived here can serve as a simple estimate of the limits of a given network configuration. This fact can be especially useful in planning tasks that require the evaluation of multiple candidate configurations. With the bounds derived here, many

inefficient configurations can be quickly ruled out without solving optimization problems.

REFERENCES

[1] R. G. Gallager, "Energy limited channels: Coding, multi-access and spread spectrum," in *Proc. Conference on Information Sciences and Systems (CISS)*, Mar 1988, p. 372.

[2] S. Verdu, "Recent results on the capacity of wideband channels in the low-power regime," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Mag.*, vol. 9, pp. 40–45, August 2002.

[3] R. L. G. Cavalcante, S. Stańczak, M. Schubert, A. Eisenbläter, and U. Türke, "Toward energy-efficient 5G wireless communication technologies," *IEEE Signal Processing Mag.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 24–34, Nov. 2014.

[4] S. Stańczak, M. Wiczanowski, and H. Boche, *Fundamentals of Resource Allocation in Wireless Networks*, 2nd ed., ser. Foundations in Signal Processing, Communications and Networking, W. Utschick, H. Boche, and R. Mathar, Eds. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 2009.

[5] M. Schubert and H. Boche, *Interference Calculus - A General Framework for Interference Management and Network Utility Optimization*. Berlin: Springer, 2011.

[6] R. L. G. Cavalcante, M. Kasparick, and S. Stańczak, "Max-min utility optimization in load coupled interference networks," submitted.

[7] D. W. Cai, T. Q. Quek, and C. W. Tan, "A unified analysis of max-min weighted SINR for MIMO downlink system," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 3850–3862, 2011.

[8] D. W. Cai, T. Q. Quek, C. W. Tan, and S. H. Low, "Max-min SINR coordinated multipoint downlink transmission - duality and algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 60, no. 10, pp. 5384–5395, 2012.

[9] Y. Huang, C. W. Tan, and B. Rao, "Joint beamforming and power control in coordinated multicell: Max-min duality, effective network and large system transition," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 2730–2742, 2013.

[10] R. Sun and Z.-Q. Luo, "Globally optimal joint uplink base station association and power control for max-min fairness," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2014, pp. 454–458.

[11] Y.-W. P. Hong, C. W. Tan, L. Zheng, C.-L. Hsieh, and C.-H. Lee, "A unified framework for wireless max-min utility optimization with general monotonic constraints," in *IEEE INFOCOM*, 2014, pp. 2076–2084.

[12] U. Krause, "Concave Perron–Frobenius theory and applications," *Nonlinear Analysis: Theory, Methods & Applications*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 1457–1466, 2001.

[13] A. Auslender and M. Teboulle, *Asymptotic Cones and Functions in Optimization and Variational Inequalities*. New York: Springer, 2003.

[14] R. L. G. Cavalcante, Y. Shen, and S. Stańczak, "Elementary properties of positive concave mappings with applications to network planning and optimization," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, vol. 64, no. 7, pp. 1774–1873, April 2016.

[15] R. L. G. Cavalcante, E. Pollakis, and S. Stanczak, "Power estimation in LTE systems with the general framework of standard interference mappings," in *IEEE Global Conference on Signal and Information Processing (GlobalSIP' 14)*, Dec. 2014.

[16] R. L. G. Cavalcante, S. Stańczak, J. Zhang, and H. Zhuang, "Low complexity iterative algorithms for power estimation in ultra-dense load coupled networks," *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing*, to appear.

[17] L. Y. Kolotilina, "Bounds and inequalities for the Perron root of a nonnegative matrix," *Journal of Mathematical Sciences*, vol. 121, no. 4, 2004.

[18] C. R. Johnson and P. Nylen, "Monotonicity properties of norms," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 148, pp. 43–58, 1991.

[19] R. D. Yates, "A framework for uplink power control in cellular radio systems," *IEEE J. Select. Areas Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 7, pp. pp. 1341–1348, Sept. 1995.

[20] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. Springer, 2011.

[21] M. Searcoíd, *Metric Spaces*. London: Springer, 2007.

[22] R. T. Rockafellar, *Convex analysis*. Princeton university press, 1970.

[23] P. Agyapong, V. Braun, M. Fallgren, A. Gouraud, M. Hessler, S. Jeux, A. Klein, J. Lianghai, D. Martn-Sacristn, M. Maternia, M. Moisio, J. F. Monserrat, K. Pawlak, H. Tullberg, and A. Weber, "Deliverable D6.1 - simulation guidelines," Mobile and wireless communications Enablers for the Twenty-twenty Information Society (METIS), Tech. Rep., Oct. 2013.

[24] "METIS ray tracing files," accessed on 20.03.2015. [Online]. Available: https://www.metis2020.com/documents/simulations/